

# Water report confusion at committee

By **Jim Eadie**

The following are notes from the Bancroft water and wastewater committee meeting May 22.

New information concerning the excess water believed to be leaking into Bancroft water treatment plant sewer lines has come to light.

The new, and sometimes confusing, information arose from the Bancroft water and wastewater committee meeting held May 22. A copy of three graphs, showing flow monitoring results in three locations during the period April 25 to 29, was distributed among committee members and reviewed.

"I think we need to ask for clarification," said Hugh Monteith, a volunteer on the committee with a background in civil engineering. "The graphs appear to be mis-labelled."

Further scrutiny revealed that one of the graphs was drawn to a different scale, causing confusion when comparing visually to the second two graphs. The graphs were set aside to seek

interpretation from the company doing the work.

## **Smart meters not recommended**

Town treasurer Arthur Smith presented the smart meter report. He recommended they're not in the budget this year.

Smith noted that the offer of a five unit trial offered by Corix Water Products at the April 25 meeting has costs associated with it.

"The no cost had a cost," said Mayor Paul Jenkins. "They sure made it sound like they would put it in five locations at no cost. I would like to get that confirmed. Please go back and re-confirm."

## **Running your water all winter has a cost**

Next on the agenda, Smith presented the cold weather waterline report.

"We can estimate the water lost during the winter as we continue to read the meter, but only bill the customer an estimate," he explained. "This year there were 28 customers running a tap under the program. The difference between the meter reading and the estimate is the amount of water that is considered lost."

Smith's report concluded: "The Winter Water Running Loss resulted in additional cost to treat the water and wastewater for the water. Additionally, this resulted in lost revenue of \$55,806.11 from the write-off of the water."

That was based on the market value of 6,787 cubic metres of water lost.

"I don't think that is a true value," said Jenkins. "It should be the production costs at the plant."

"Yes, the cost per cubic metre coming out of the plant," said Councillor Mary Kavanagh. "Putting a price tag on it is very confusing."

## **Blocked bypass saves extra processing**

Duane Forth, new project manager of wastewater, informed the committee that he blocked the bypass to the river at the treatment

plant during the April 25 to 27 rainfalls. The bypass is an outlet that discharges untreated material into the river if the capacity of the plant is exceeded. Forth noted that the river level raised above the level of the bypass and would have flowed into the plant during those several days had it not been blocked.

?It kept the river water from entering the plant and being treated,? he said. ?The plant worked successfully and took the full flow [sewage] during that time. I am looking to install a check valve in the bypass.?